

IPCC Working Group I Fourth Assessment Report

Expert and Government Review Comments on the Second-Order Draft

Chapter 3

Batch B (15 June 2006)

Notes

The following table of expert and government review comments are for consideration by the chapter author teams. They require a formal response to each comment from the team, and those responses will be archived.

Responding to review comments and record keeping

The chapter writing teams must consider all review comments and record an agreed response in the following table. This may be done by discussing the more general and substantive comments among the whole author team and then allocating responsibilities for responding to specific comments to the relevant authors. Note that responses should be understandable by someone scrutinizing the archived comments file after the report has been finalized.

Responses should generally be brief but clear. The following, or similar, styles of responses are suggested:

- Where the authors agree with the comment and have made a corresponding change:
Accepted - without comment (e.g., in case of minor modifications) or with brief comments (e.g., where partially accepted)
- Where the authors agree with the comment and changes are not necessary or changes are made in a different section:
Taken into account - with brief explanation (e.g. “see section X.Y”)
- Where the comment does not require a specific change, or the issue is already dealt with in the draft:
No change necessary – with brief explanation where appropriate (e.g. “covered in next paragraph”, “covered in section X.Y”)
- Where the authors do not agree with a suggested change:
Rejected – always with a brief explanation (e.g. “insufficient literature to support this”, “outside scope of section”, “outside purview and competence of WG1”, etc)
- Where dealing with very similar comments or a common thread of comments from one reviewer and a response has been given to the corresponding earlier comment(s):
See comment X-Y.
- Only where it is clear that the reviewer is not suggesting a specific revision to the chapter.
Noted - with or without comments.

It is recommended that you do not use names of individual members of the author team in the final responses to comments. I.e., responses should represent the entire chapter team. Where a comment involves another chapter please liaise with the authors of that chapter as appropriate but retain the comment and response in the comment file that you were sent. I.e., do not transfer comments.

Please provide the Technical Support Unit with the completed version of this document as a single electronic file by August 4, 2006.

No.	Batch	Page:line		Comment	Notes
		From	To		
3-1257	B	0:		In the following comments to the second-order draft, I repeat in abbreviated but clarified form a few of my comments to the first-order draft; although it seems that that these comments were not considered or accepted, I think these points are important. [Christian-D. Schoenwiese (Reviewer's comment ID #: 310-1)]	
3-1258	B	5:48	5:49	The "first recorded" wording may not be correct, since there are non reliable statistics of these events. I would prefer the use of "unusual" since there is not guarantee that other events may have occurred in the past. [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-1)]	
3-1259	B	7:17	7:29	If these definitions are consistent with those used in Chapter 9, may be there is not need to repeat them here and just refer to Chapter 9. It may be confusing. [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-2)]	
3-1260	B	10:17	10:19	I believe that this is an attribution statements, that is more suitable to Chapter 9 than in Chapter 3 [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-3)]	
3-1261	B	15:54	15:57	The explanations on the effects of aerosols are on attribution, and again are suitable for Chapter 9 and not in Chapter 3 [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-4)]	
3-1262	B	31:12	31:12	Can you include in this section a discussion of shortwave absorption by water vapor. This is an important quantitative effect and there is negligible discussion of it. [Stephen McIntyre (Reviewer's comment ID #: 309-8)]	
3-1263	B	31:12	31:12	Can you update the status of the anomalous absorption problem here. Ramanathan 1997 attributed this to water vapor. What's happened? [Stephen McIntyre (Reviewer's comment ID #: 309-9)]	
3-1264	B	36:14	36:15	I believe that the word is "could" and not "cloud" [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-5)]	
3-1265	B	55:30	55:34	There should be a mention to soil moisture variability together with snow, since soil moisture is important in regions other than the Indian monsoon (Himalayas). [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-6)]	
3-1266	B	59:40		Insert reference "Trömel and Schönwiese, 2005" (already existent in the list of references; in this paper a new method is introduced which allows to compute exactly the time history (time functions) of all PDF parameters for every year and, in turn, the probability that defined upper or lower thresholds are exceeded by extremes. [Christian-D. Schoenwiese (Reviewer's comment ID #: 310-2)]	
3-1267	B	62:21		Insert reference "Schönwiese et al., 2003" and add to the reference list (full reference: "Schönwiese, C.D., J. Grieser and S. Trömel, 2003: Secular change of extreme monthly	

No.	Batch	Page:line		Comment	Notes
		From	To		
				precipitation in Europe. Theor. Appl. Climatol., 75, 245-250"; in this paper an outstanding increase of extreme monthly winter precipitation in the second half of the 20th century is found, to a smaller extent also in other seasons, contrasted by a small decrease of extreme summer precipitation in Germany). [Christian-D. Schoenwiese (Reviewer's comment ID #: 310-3)]	
3-1268	B	66:44	66:57	In this context the NOAA statistics of the extreme hurricane season 2005 should be mentioned (27 named tropical storms, last one "Zeta" at the very end of this year, 15 hurricanes, hurricane Wilma lowest mean sea level air pressure any observed within the center of a hurricane). [Christian-D. Schoenwiese (Reviewer's comment ID #: 310-4)]	
3-1269	B	68:2	68:9	I suggest the use of the word possibly (as... "possibly the first....") [Govt. of Brazil (Reviewer's comment ID #: 2024-7)]	
3-1270	B	71:38		Insert reference "Schönwiese et al., 2005" and add to the reference list (full reference: "Schönwiese, C.D., T. Staeger and S. Trömel, 2004: The hot summer 2003 in Germany. Meteorol. Z., 13, 323-327"; in this paper we quantify, based on a 1761-2003 observation data base, June, July, and August surface air temperature anomalies and show not only, that this summer 2003 was by far the hottest observed since 1761 in Germany but also, that the probability of occurrence has dramatically increased within the recent 20-30 years. [Christian-D. Schoenwiese (Reviewer's comment ID #: 310-5)]	